



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/495,268	01/31/2000	Michael O. Cimini	13D13211	4650
29399	7590	10/03/2005	EXAMINER	
JOHN S. BEULICK C/O ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP ONE METROPOLITAN SQUARE SUITE 2600 ST. LOUIS, MO 63102-2740			WOO, ISAAC M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2162	

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/495,268

Applicant(s)

CIMINI ET AL.

Examiner

Isaac M. Woo

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

AT

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Applicant's Arguments, filed on July 08, 2005 have been considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Claims 1-20 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. In response to Applicant's remark filed on July 08, 2005, applicant argues Durbin (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0055910) does not disclose or suggest database tables including failure mode associated with the error proofing example and meta data entered by a user. However, examiner does not agree. Applicant recites the definition of the error proofing example from specification on page 1, lines, 15-22, "the present invention is a web-based system that facilitates rapid and reliable **documenting, cataloging, and distributing of proven error proofing techniques**, a system includes a web site that contains categorized error proofing techniques applicable to a broad range of design, manufacturing, assembly, product test, product service, and other processes. A graphical user interface also is provided so that error proofing techniques can be easily and reliably submitted to the web site for cataloging and distribution". The error proofing examples are document data that can be distributed. Durbin discloses, dynamic data distribution as the applicant mentioned from remark filed on July 08, 2005. Thus, the

term recited in claimed limitation "the error proofing example" distribution cannot be given any patentable weight over Durbin. Thus, Durbin discloses, database tables including failure mode associated with the error proofing example and meta data entered by a user and applicant's arguments, filed on July 08, 2005, are not persuasive.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Durbin (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0055910).

With respect to claims 1 and 13, Durbin discloses, plurality of clients (12, fig. 1, section [0032]), each the client comprising a plurality of user interface classes (section [0034]) and at least one class that provides access to a database (30, fig. 1, java class data, section [0032]); server (26, fig. 1, section [0031]) comprising a plurality of servlets (class server stores Java class), at least some of the servlets providing at least one of a database (30, fig. 1, java class data, section [0032]); and server access capability to each the client, see (section [0031], class server 26 which stores the encrypted Java

classes ready for downloading to the client platform 12 on request); and database comprising a plurality of tables, at least one of the tables (30, fig. 1, java class data, section [0032]) comprising meta-data that the database accessed by each the client via the server, see (section [0031], class server 26 which stores the encrypted Java classes ready for downloading to the client platform 12 on request). Durbin does not explicitly disclose, at least one error proofing example entered by a user and describes the at least one error proofing example, at least one of the tables comprising at least one failure mode associated with the error proofing example, the error proofing example, at least one failure mode when creating the at least one error proofing example. However, applicant discloses from specification page on lines 15-22, "present invention is a web-based system that facilitates rapid and reliable documenting, cataloging, and distributing of proven error proofing techniques. More specifically, and in an exemplary embodiment, a system includes a web site that contains categorized error proofing techniques applicable to a broad range of design, manufacturing, assembly, product test, product service, and other processes", and page on lines 1-8, "The user interface classes include two main visual that provide access to the error proofing capabilities, including creating new error proofing examples, performing queries, and downloading documents". This means that a user can download document from server database includes error proofing examples. The error proofing example is a type of document data. Durbin discloses downloading data from server database table, see (30, fig. 1, java class data, section [0032]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Durbin by

Art Unit: 2162

incorporating at least one error proofing example entered by a user and describes the at least one error proofing example, at least one of the tables comprising at least one failure mode associated with the error proofing example, the error proofing example, at least one failure mode when creating the at least one error proofing example. Thus, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to use such a modification because that would provide Durbin's system the enhanced Java-based page useful documents (error proofing example document) retrieving method user a user.

With respect to claim 2, Durbin discloses, each user interface classes comprises at least two visual components for controlling information shown to a user and for handling user input, see (fig. 1, section [0031]-[0032]).

With respect to claim 3, Durbin discloses that one of the user interface classes constructs and displays a menu of web pages that user can view, see (fig. 1, section [0031]-[0034]).

With respect to claim 4, Durbin discloses that one of the user interface classes initializes and displays forms, see (fig. 1, section [0031]-[0035]).

With respect to claim 5, Durbin discloses that the class that provides access to the database formats SQL statements and invokes request to servlets (java class

Art Unit: 2162

running server) in the server that provide database access, see (fig. 1, section [0031]-[0035]).

With respect to claim 6, Durbin discloses that the server comprises servlets for database queries and updating, uploading and updating the database, downloading and extracting user permissions from the database, see (fig. 1, section [0031]-[0035]).

With respect to claims 7, 8 and 9, Durbin discloses that one of the tables stores process which an error proofing example applies and failure modes associated with an error proofing example, part families and solution stage, see (fig. 1, section [0031]-[0035]).

With respect to claim 10, Durbin discloses that one of the tables data identifying users of the error proofing web site, see (section [0013]-[0018]).

With respect to claim 11, Durbin discloses that one of the tables stores textual data relating to the error proofing example, see (fig. 1, section [0031]-[0035]).

With respect to claim 12, Durbin discloses that one of the tables stores a principle and related strategy that are associated with an error proofing example, see (fig. 1, section [0031]-[0035]).

With respect to claim 14, Durbin discloses at least one interface class to provide access to a database, providing at least two visual components for controlling information shown to a user and for handling user input, see (fig. 1, section [0031]-[0035]).

With respect to claim 15, Durbin discloses that the providing at least two visual components for controlling information shown to a user and for handling user input comprises the constructing and displaying a menu of web pages that a user can view, see (fig. 1, section [0031]-[0035]).

With respect to claim 16, Durbin discloses that the providing at least two visual components for controlling information shown to a user and for handling user input comprises the initializing and displaying forms, see (fig. 1, section [0031]-[0035]).

With respect to claim 17, Durbin discloses that the providing access to database formats SQL statements and invoking request to servlets in the server that provide database access, see (fig. 1, section [0031]-[0035]).

With respect to claim 18, Durbin discloses that querying database, uploading a document and updating the database, and downloading a document and extracting user permission from the database, see (section [0013]-[0018]).



With respect to claim 19, Durbin discloses that the storing processes in the table to which an error proofing example applies, see (section [0013]-[0018]).

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 20 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### ***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

**Contact Information**

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac M. Woo whose telephone number is (571) 272-4043. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

IMW  
September 26, 2005

  
JEAN M. CORRIELUS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER